REMARKS

In response to the office action dated 3 January 2006, the applicants request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 and 20-27 are allowed, claims 16-19 and 29-30 are objected to, and claims 14, 15, and 28 are rejected. None of the claims are amended.

Allowable Subject Matter

The office action indicated that claims 1-13 and 20-27 are allowed. The office action also indicated that claims 16-19 and 29-30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The applicant reserves the right to rewrite claims 16-19 and 29-30 in independent form, but believes that all of the claims are allowable in view of the remarks made herein.

Rejection of Claims Under §102

Claims 14-15 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mooney et al. (U.S. 6,452,428, Mooney). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 14 recites a "simultaneous bidirectional port circuit" including "a data driver having an output impedance control circuit to modify an output impedance of the data driver" and "a synchronization circuit to alert a second simultaneous bidirectional port circuit that the output impedance has been modified." Claim 15 is dependent on claim 14.

Mooney relates to a "slew rate control circuit."[1] Mooney shows in Figure 1 two circuits 102, 104 that communicate simultaneously in both directions over a single line 106. Each circuit 102, 104 is the same having a driver 110 and a receiver 112.[2]

Mooney does not show a synchronization circuit as is recited in independent claim 14. The reference circuit 114 of Mooney "provides a trip point to receiver 112,"[3] and does not "alert a second simultaneous bidirectional port circuit" as is recited in claim 14. The only communication between the circuits 102, 104 is a communication of data over the line 106. The reference circuit 114 of Mooney only communicates inside the circuit 102, and does not

[1] Mooney, Title.
[2] Mooney, column 3, lines 12-30.
[3] Mooney, column 3, lines 12-30.

communicate with the circuit 104, and therefore does not "alert a second simultaneous bidirectional port circuit that the output impedance has been modified" as is recited in claim 14.

The office action states that all of the features recited in independent claim 28 are found in Mooney, column 3, lines 12-54.[4] However, Mooney does not describe "de-asserting a ready signal" or "asserting the ready signal" as is recited in claim 28. The cited text of Mooney discusses the system 100, the transmission of data over the line 106, and the impedance and the slew rate of the driver 110.[5] The office action paraphrases the features of claim 28 and points to a section of text in Mooney without showing specific details in Mooney that correspond to the features of claim 28. The applicants respectfully submit that Mooney does not show the features recited in claim 28 that are referred to in the office action.

The applicants respectfully submit that Mooney does not show all of the features recited in independent claims 14 and 28, and that claims 14 and 28 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 is dependent on independent claim 14, and recites further features with respect to claim 14. For reasons analogous to those stated above, and the features in the claim, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is not shown by Mooney, and that claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

[4] Office action, page 3.
[5] Mooney, column 3, lines 12-54.

CONCLUSION

The applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney at 612-373-6973 to discuss any questions which may remain with respect to the present application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW B. HAYCOCK ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6973

Date 3 April 2006 By _____
Robert E. Mates
Reg. No. 35,271

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 3rd day of April, 2006.

Name: Amy Moriarty Signature: _____